arXiv:hep-th/9403010v1 2 Mar 1994

Comment on
Anyon in an external electromagnetic field: Hamiltonian and Lagrangian formulations

M. Chaichian, R. Gonzales Felipe and D. Louis Martinez
Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 3405 (1993)

by

R. Jackiw (MIT) and V. P. Nair (C.C.N.Y.)

In their recent letter, Chaichian *et. al.* (CFM) present a Lagrangian for a massive (m) point particle on the plane, with which they claim to realize anyon statistics [1]. However, we find that there are some inaccuracies in their formulation and, when these are taken care of, well-known results are reproduced, which already exist in the literature [2]. The CFM Lagrangian is $L_{\mathrm{CFM}} = m\,(\dot{x}\cdot\dot{n})\,/\sqrt{\dot{n}^2}$. The particle coordinate is $x^\mu(\tau)$; $n^\mu(\tau)$ is an auxiliary variable for which it is asserted that $n^2 = -1$ (space-like), but this constraint is not enforced by L_{CFM}, rather it is imposed "by hand". However, the fixed magnitude of n renders inconsistent the equations implied by L_{CFM}. These equations read

$$p_\mu \equiv \frac{\partial L_{\mathrm{CFM}}}{\partial \dot{x}^\mu} = m\dot{n}_\mu/\sqrt{\dot{n}^2} \quad , \qquad \dot{p}_\mu = 0 \tag{1a,b}$$

$$p_\mu n^\mu = 0 \quad , \qquad p^2 = m^2 \tag{2a,b}$$

$$p^{(n)}_\mu \equiv \frac{\partial L_{\mathrm{CFM}}}{\partial \dot{n}^\mu} = \frac{m}{\sqrt{\dot{n}^2}}\left\{\dot{x}_\mu - \dot{n}_\mu \frac{\dot{x}\cdot\dot{n}}{\dot{n}^2}\right\} \tag{3}$$

$$p^\mu \cdot p^{(n)}_\mu = 0 \tag{4}$$

But from (1) it follows by virtue of (2) that $0 = n^\mu \dot{p}_\mu = -\dot{n}^\mu p_\mu = -m\sqrt{\dot{n}^2}$. Vanishing $\dot{n}^2$ contradicts the authors' statement "assume $\dot{n}^\mu$ to be a timelike vector" and renders (1a) and (3) meaningless. Indeed it is easy to show that the above equations imply n^μ is constant,

$$\dot{n}^\mu = 0 \tag{5}$$

which accentuates the problem.

While L_{CFM}, which is quadratic in derivatives, is inconsistent, a formulation linear in derivatives (*e.g.* as advocated in [3]) may be given. The alternative Lagrangian is taken to be

$$\tilde{L}_{\mathrm{CFM}} = -p_\mu \dot{x}^\mu - p^{(n)}_\mu \dot{n}^\mu - \frac{\lambda}{2}(n^2+1) - \Lambda_1(p^2 - m^2) - \lambda_1(p_\mu n^\mu) - \lambda_2(p^\mu p^{(n)}_\mu) \tag{6}$$

The condition $n^2 = -1$ is enforced explicitly. Quantization proceeds by recognizing that the last two constraints are second-class (in Dirac's terminology). We incorporate them through

Dirac brackets, thereby eliminating them. The first two constraints are first-class and are retained as conditions on states. This leads to the following non-vanishing commutators:

$$[x_\mu,\, x_\nu] = i\left(n_\mu p^{(n)}_\nu - n_\nu p^{(n)}_\mu\right)/p^2 \tag{7a}$$

$$[x_\mu,\, p_\nu] = -ig_{\mu\nu} \tag{7b}$$

$$[x_\mu,\, n_\nu] = in_\mu p_\nu/p^2 \tag{7c}$$

$$[x_\mu,\, p^{(n)}_\nu] = ip^{(n)}_\mu p_\nu/p^2 \tag{7d}$$

$$[n_\mu,\, p^{(n)}_\nu] = -i\left(g_{\mu\nu} - p_\mu p_\nu/p^2\right) \tag{7e}$$

[Except for (7e), these coincide with the Dirac brackets (11) in [1].] The Hamiltonian reads $H = \frac{\lambda}{2}(n^2+1) + \Lambda_1(p^2 - m^2)$ and generates the equations $\dot{p}_\mu = 0$ and $\dot{n}^\mu = 0$, consistent with (1) and (5). Also one gets $\dot{x}_\mu = -2\Lambda_1 p_\mu$, $\dot{p}^{(n)}_\mu = \lambda n_\mu$. These may be integrated to

$$x^\mu(\tau) = \alpha(\tau)p^\mu + x^\mu_0 \tag{8}$$

$$p^{(n)}_\mu(\tau) = \beta(\tau)\eta_\mu + p^{0\,(n)}_\mu \tag{9}$$

with $\dot{\alpha} = -2\Lambda_1$, $\dot{\beta} = \lambda$, and $p^2 = m^2$, $n^2 = -1$, $p\cdot n = 0$, $p\cdot p^{0\,(n)} = 0$, the last two implying $p\cdot p^{(n)} = 0$. In this way the problematic Eqs. (1a) and (3) are avoided. Evidently the motion of $\mathbf{x}$ is free: $\mathbf{x}(t) = \mathbf{v}t + \mathit{constant}$, where $\mathbf{v} \equiv \mathbf{p}/\sqrt{\mathbf{p}^2 + m^2}$ is constant.

The anomalous spin emerges when we define (following CFM)

$$n_\mu p^{(n)}_\nu - n_\nu p^{(n)}_\mu = -\epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha}S^\alpha \tag{10a}$$

$$S^\alpha = -sp^\alpha/(p^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{10b}$$

That S^α is proportional to p^α follows from the constraints *i.e.* from the fact that the left side of (10a) is transverse to p. Also since $s = (p^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma}n_\alpha p^{(n)}_\beta p_\gamma$ it is seen that s is conserved and commutes with $(x^\mu,\, p_\nu)$. Moreover, the Dirac commutators (7) imply that S^α commutes with itself, as can be verified either by using the left side of (10a) or the right side of (10b). [This contradicts Eq. (8) in [1].] However upon forming the combination

$$J^\alpha = -\epsilon^{\alpha\mu\nu}x_\mu p_\nu + S^\alpha \tag{11}$$

one establishes the $O(2,1)$ Lorentz algebra, which would not be satisfied by $-\epsilon^{\alpha\mu\nu}x_\mu p_\nu$ alone.

$$[J^\alpha, J^\beta] = i\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma}J_\gamma \tag{12}$$

Thus S^α does indeed describe an anomalous spin. But now it is recognized that this realization, when viewed solely in the x-p subspace of variables, *i.e.* using

$$[x_\mu,\, x_\nu] = i\epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha}\frac{sp^\alpha}{(p^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}} \tag{13}$$

and (7b), (10b), (11), (12), is nothing but a "magnetic monopole", whose strength is not quantized, because its space is non-compact p-space. Dynamics can be described solely in terms of x and p based on the Lagrangian

$$L\,d\tau = -p_\mu dx^\mu + A_\mu(p)dp^\mu - \Lambda_1(p^2 - m^2)d\tau \tag{14}$$

where $A \equiv A_\mu(p)dp^\mu$ is the Dirac-monopole 1-form, whose 2-form $dA = \frac{s}{2(p^2)^{3/2}}\epsilon_{\alpha\mu\nu}p^\alpha dp^\mu dp^\nu$ (wedge or antisymmetrized product for differential forms is understood). Also, we see that the motion is free.

$$\dot{p}_\mu = 0 \quad , \qquad \dot{x}^\mu = -2\Lambda_1 p^\mu \tag{15}$$

The Lagrangian (14) leads to the symplectic structure

$$\omega \;=\; -dp_\mu dx^\mu \;+\; \frac{s}{2(p^2)^{\frac{3}{2}}}\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma}p^\alpha dp^\beta dp^\gamma \tag{16}$$

and the consequent commutation rules (13). This realization of anomalous spin is well known [2].

The crucial ingredients for a description of anyons are thus seen to be the symplectic 2-form ω of (16) and the mass-shell condition. Thus seemingly different Lagrangians are possible, provided they enforce (16) and the mass-shell condition. An alternative to (14), which is in fact a different parametrization of the dynamical variables, is [4]

$$\tilde{L}\,d\tau \;=\; -p_\mu dx^\mu \;-\; \frac{is}{2}\,\mathrm{Tr}\,(\Lambda^{-1}d\Lambda\, M_{12}) \tag{17}$$

where Λ is an $SO(2,1)$-matrix and M_{12} is the generator of the rotation subgroup *Rot* of $SO(2,1)$. Λ obeys the constraint equation

$$\Lambda^\mu_0 = p^\mu/(p^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \qquad \text{or} \qquad \eta^\nu\Lambda^\mu_\nu \;=\; p^\mu/(p^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \qquad \eta^\nu \;= (1,0,0) \tag{18}$$

The Lagrangian (17) leads to the symplectic structure

$$\omega \;=\; -dp_\mu dx^\mu \;+\; \frac{is}{2}\mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda^{-1}d\Lambda\;\Lambda^{-1}d\Lambda\; M_{12}) \tag{19}$$

This is equivalent to (16) by virtue of the constraint (18). The parametrization in (18) shows that the part of the symplectic form which describes spin is the Kirillov-Kostant form on $SO(2,1)/\mathit{Rot}$.

---

1. M. Chaichian, R. Gonzales Felipe and D. Louis Martinez, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**, 3405 (1993).
2. R. Jackiw and V. P. Nair, *Phys. Rev. D* **43**, 1933 (1991); S. Forte, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **64**, 192 (1992).
3. L. Faddeev and R. Jackiw, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60**, 1692 (1988).
4. A.P. Balachandran *et al*, *Gauge Symmetries and Fibre Bundles*, (Springer, Berlin, 1983) and references therein; S. Forte, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.*, **A7**, 1025 (1992).